



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/990,341	11/20/2001	Scott Montgomery	703602.2	2692
34313 7590 03/28/2008 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP IP PROSECUTION DEPARTMENT 4 PARK PLAZA SUITE 1600 IRVINE, CA 92614-2558				
			EXAMINER MURDOUGH, JOSHUA A	
			ART UNIT 3621	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/28/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/990,341

Applicant(s)

MONTGOMERY ET AL.

Examiner

JOSHUA MURDOUGH

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 14-17, 22-25, 27-34, 36-38 and 66-84 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 14-17, 22-25, 27-34, 36-38 and 66-84 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgements

1. The Examiner for this case has changed. Please note that Joshua Murdough is the Examiner of record in any future correspondence.
2. Due to Applicants' amendment to the claims received on 27 December 2007, the current status of the claims is:

Claims 1-11, 14-17, 22-25, 27-34, 36-38, and 66-84 are pending.

Claims 12, 13, 18-21, 26, and 39-65 have been canceled.

3. The Examiner acknowledges Applicants' affirmation that "the subject matter described by the claims has been commonly owned at all times." (Page 11, Paragraphs 2 & 3)

Specification

4. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: at least claims 1, 14, 27, and 70 require the indicium and the indexing tracking ID to be "independent." "The meaning of every term used in any of the claims should be apparent from the descriptive portion of the specification with clear disclosure as to its import," (MPEP § 608.01(o)) but there is no disclosure in the specification regarding the meaning of "independent."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 1st Paragraph

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-11, 14-17, 22-25, 27-34, 36-38, and 66-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no disclosure of the indicium and the indexing tracking ID being independent as claimed in each of the independent claims; 1, 14, 27, and 70.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 2nd Paragraph

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: the obtaining, reading, or generating of the indexing tracking ID by the postal authority.

The indexing tracking ID is transmitted to the end user computer in line 9 of claim 1. From there, the most logical and simplest steps would be for the end user computer to print the indexing tracking number on the mail piece and then the user would enter the mail piece into the postal authority's network. Once in the network, the postal authority could read the indexing

tracking ID off of the mail piece. This would enable the postal authority to request the indicium from the vendor-controlled centralized postage issuing computer system.

If this is in fact what is intended, these steps should be included in the claim. If this is not what was intended, the appropriate alternate steps should be included.

9. Claims 1-11, 27-34, 36-38, and 66-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

10. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the indexed postage indicium data" in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Nowhere in the claim is it shown that the postage indicium data is indexed.

11. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the centralized postage issuing computer system" in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The Examiner believes that this was intended to be a reference to "the vendor-controlled centralized postage issuing computer system" in line 4, but due to the difference in naming, cannot conclusively make that association.

12. Claims 1, 27, and 70 recite the term "independent" in a manner that provides for different, distinct interpretations which renders the claims indefinite. As used, independent could mean that the indicium and the indexing tracking ID occur in different locations on the mail piece; it could also mean that they can be read separately, as is claimed in claim 14; it could further mean that the data sources are different; or it could have other meanings that have not occurred to the Examiner.

In order to further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner has used the following definition when evaluating the claims on their merits:

Independent: "1. b (1) not requiring or relying on something else." Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 10th Edition, Merriam-Webster Inc., Springfield, M.A., 1997.

Specifically, the Examiner has interpreted this term, in view of the definition provided, to mean that the indexing tracking ID does not need the indicium to function and vice versa.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

14. Claims 27-34, 36-38, 70-78, 81, and 83 as best understood are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Whitehouse (U.S. 6,005,945).

15. As to claim 27, Whitehouse shows:

A centralized postage-issuing computer system for indexing a postage indicium,
comprising:

data processing circuitry (Figure 4, element 150);

a database (Figure 4, element 156);

a postage indicium generation module (Figure 4, element 160), operable with the data processing circuitry (connected to 150), configured for generating a data corresponding to a postage indicium;

an indexing module (Figure 4, element 161), operable with the data processing circuitry (connected to 150), configured for associating an indexing tracking ID with the data corresponding to the postage indicium, wherein the indexing tracking ID and postage indicium are independent (both pieces of data are part of the transaction); and

a database management module (Figure 4, element 174), operable with the data processing circuitry (connected to 150), configured for storing the indexed data corresponding to the postage indicium within the database, and for retrieving the indexed data corresponding to the postage indicium from the database based on the indexing tracking ID (databases are designed to store and retrieve data and a transaction database would store and retrieve transaction information); and

a communications module (Figure 4, element 152), operable with the data processing circuitry (connected to 150), configured for transmitting the indexing tracking ID to an end user computer (Figure 4, 104), for receiving a postage indicium request containing the indexing tracking ID from a postal authority, and for transmitting the retrieved indexed data corresponding to the postage indicium to the postal authority (Figure 4, 180).

16. As to claim 28, Whitehouse further shows:

the indexing tracking ID is unique within a postal authority (Column 4, lines 43-50).

17. As to claim 29, Whitehouse further shows
the postal authority is the United States Postal Service (Column 4, line 59).
18. As to claim 30, Whitehouse further shows:
the data corresponding to the postage indicium comprises data representative of one or
more items selected from the group consisting of postage amount, date and time
of postage information creation, service class, optional data advance, and delivery
zip code (Column 22, lines 9-20).
19. As to claim 31, Whitehouse further shows:
the postage indicium generation module is configured for generating self-validating data
corresponding to the postage indicium in response to the indexing identifier
request (Abstract), the indexing module is configured for associating the indexing
tracking ID with the self-validating data corresponding to the postage indicium
(Both are transaction data and are needed (they are sent together and printed on
the same mail piece), and
the database management module is configured for storing the indexed self-validating
data corresponding to the postage indicium within the database (it is transaction
data, which would logically go in a transaction database).
20. As to claim 32, Whitehouse further shows:
the postage indicium generation module comprises:
a postage indicium generation submodule (Figure 4, element 168) for generating the data
corresponding to the postage indicium;

- a digital signature generation submodule (Figure 4, element 164) for generating the a digital signature; and
- an association submodule (Figure 4, element 162) for associating the digital signature with the data corresponding to the postage indicium to generate the self-validating indexed data corresponding to the postage indicium (Figure 4, element 107).
21. As to claim 33, Whitehouse further shows:
- the database is communicatively coupled with a local physically secure coprocessor device (Column 14, lines 8-10).
22. As to claim 34, Whitehouse further shows:
- the communications module is further configured for receiving an indexing identifier request from an end user computer (Figure 5A, step 200).
23. As to claims 36-38, Whitehouse further shows that the method is designed for multiple mail pieces from different end user computers (Abstract).
24. As to claim 70, Whitehouse shows:
- A method of processing a mail piece, the method comprising:
- sending (Figure 4, Arrow pointing down between 112 and 152), from an end user computer (Figure 4, element 104), postage information related to a mail piece (Figure 4, element 105) and a request for an indexing tracking ID (represented by: Figure 2, two dimensional barcode) to a vendor-controlled centralized postage issuing computer system (Figure 4, element 102),
- wherein the vendor is in communication with (Figure 4, Arrow between 180 and 152) a postal authority (Figure 4, element 180) and

- wherein the postage information is configured to allow the vendor to generate (Figure 4, element 154) data corresponding to a postage indicium (Figure 4, element 107) for the mail piece,
- the indexing tracking ID being associated (by being on the same mail piece) with the data corresponding to the postage indicium;
- receiving the indexing tracking ID at the end user computer (Figure 4, arrow pointing up between elements 152 and 112); and
- applying the indexing tracking ID to the mail piece (through printer, Figure 4, element 108), wherein the indexing tracking ID is independently readable from any postage indicium present on the mail piece (As they are in separate regions of the mail piece, they can inherently be read separately).
25. As to claim 71, Whitehouse further shows:
- receiving data corresponding to a postage indicium (inherent to producing an indicium), wherein the postage indicium data is based on the postage information (an indicium needs to have the postage data to be an indicium); and
- applying the postage indicium to the mail piece (through printer, Figure 4, element 108).
26. As to claim 72, Whitehouse further shows:
- the indexing tracking ID is unique within a postal authority (Column 4, lines 43-50).
27. As to claim 73, Whitehouse further shows:
- The method of claim 72, wherein the postal authority is the United States Postal Service (Column 4, line 59).
28. As to claim 74, Whitehouse further shows:

the data corresponding to the postage indicium comprises data representative of one or more items selected from the group consisting of postage amount, date and time of postage information creation, service class, optional data advance, and delivery zip code (Column 22, lines 9-20).

29. As to claim 75, Whitehouse further shows:

the received data corresponding to the postage indicium comprises a digital signature (Abstract).

30. As to claim 76, Whitehouse further shows:

the centralized postage issuing computer system is controlled by a vendor (Column 19, lines 8-9) in communication with the postal authority (Figure 4, arrow between 152 and 180).

31. As to claim 77, Whitehouse further shows:

the indexing tracking ID is applied to the mail piece in a barcode format (Figure 2, barcode) independent from the postage indicium (Figure 2, box in upper right).

32. As to claim 78, Whitehouse further shows:

the barcode format is a two-dimensional barcode format (Figure 2, barcode).

33. As to claim 81, Whitehouse further shows:

the postage indicium is applied in a machine readable format (barcodes are machine readable).

34. As to claim 83, Whitehouse further shows:

the postage information and the request for an indexing tracking ID are sent together by the end user computer (As they are not shown to be processed separately, the Examiner interprets this to mean they are sent together).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

35. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

36. Claims 1-11, 14-17, 22, 23, 67, 69 and 84 as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitehouse in view of Bailey et al. (U.S. 2005/0209976) ("Bailey").

37. As to claim 1, Whitehouse shows:

A method of processing a mail piece, the method comprising:
generating a data corresponding to a postage indicium (Figure 4, element 168) associated with a mail piece (Figure 4, element 105) at a vendor-controlled centralized postage issuing computer system (Figure 4, element 102);
storing the indexed postage indicium data within a database of the centralized postage issuing computer system (Figure 4, element 174);
associating (by being on the same mail piece) an indexing tracking ID (represented by: Figure 2, two dimensional barcode) with the postage indicium (Figure 2, box in

upper right), wherein the indexing tracking ID and postage indicium are independent (they are separate entities that can function without the other); transmitting the indexing tracking ID to an end user computer (Figure 4, arrow between elements 152 and 112);

Whitehouse does not expressly show:

receiving a postage indicium request from a postal authority, the postage indicium request containing the indexing tracking ID; and
retrieving the indexed postage indicium data from the database based on the read indexing tracking ID.

However, Bailey shows the postal authority scanning the indexing tracking ID from the mail piece in order to request the indicium data so it can be validated (Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of Whitehouse to include the scanning and validating process of Bailey in order to reject envelopes with invalid postage (Bailey, Abstract).

38. As to claim 14, Whitehouse shows:

A method of processing a mail piece, the method comprising:
receiving data corresponding to a postage indicium (Figure 4, element 106; keyboard, mouse, and scale all provide data),
the postage indicium (Figure 2, box in upper right) being associated (by being on the same mail piece) with the indexing tracking ID (represented by: Figure 2, two dimensional barcode),

wherein the indexing tracking ID is readable on the mail piece independent of the data corresponding to the postage indicium (As they are in separate regions of the mail piece, they can inherently be read separately).

Whitehouse does not expressly show:

reading an indexing tracking ID on a mail piece;

transmitting a postage indicium request to a vendor, wherein the request comprises the read indexing tracking ID;

However, Bailey shows the postal authority scanning the indexing tracking ID from the mail piece in order to request the indicium data so it can be validated (Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of Whitehouse to include the scanning and validating process of Bailey in order to reject envelopes with invalid postage (Bailey, Abstract).

39. As to claims 2 and 15, Whitehouse further shows:

the indexing tracking ID is unique within the postal authority (Column 4, lines 43-50)

40. As to claims 3 and 16, the Whitehouse further shows:

the postal authority is the United States Postal Service. (Column 4, line 59)

41. As to claims 4 and 17, Whitehouse further shows:

the postage indicium data comprises data representative of one or more items selected from the group consisting of postage amount, date and time of postage information creation, service class, optional data advance, and delivery zip code (Column 22, lines 9-20).

42. As to claim 5, Whitehouse further shows:

deriving a digital signature from the postage indicium data (Abstract);
associating the digital signature with the postage indicium data to generate indexed self-
validating postage indicium data (Abstract); and
storing the indexed self-validating postage indicium data within the centralized postage-
issuing computer system (Figure 3, Upload Audit Information).

43. As to claim 6, Whitehouse further shows:

the digital signature association comprises attaching the digital signature to the postage
indiciu data (Abstract).

44. As to claim 7, Whitehouse further shows:

the digital signature is generated by applying a private key to the postage indicium data
(Abstract).

45. As to claim 8, Whitehouse further shows:

the indexed self-validating postage indicium data is generated within a physically secure
coprocessor device (Column 14, lines 8-10).

46. As to claim 9, Whitehouse further shows:

receiving an indexing identifier request from the end user computer (Figure 5A, step 200)
prior to transmitting the indexing tracking ID to the end user computer (Figure
5A, step 214).

47. As to claim 10, Whitehouse further shows:

transmitting the indexed postage indicium data to the postal authority (Figure 7, arrow to
252).

48. As to claim 11, Whitehouse further shows that the method is designed for multiple mail pieces (Abstract).

49. As to claim 22, Whitehouse further shows:
the indexing tracking ID is in a barcode format (Figure 2), and the indexing tracking ID is read using a barcode reader (inherent, as a barcode reader is needed to read a barcode).

50. As to claim 23, Whitehouse further shows:
the barcode format is two- dimensional barcode format (Figure 2).

51. As to claim 67, Whitehouse further shows:
the indexing tracking ID is independently readable (As they are in separate regions of the mail piece, they can inherently be read separately).

52. As to claim 69, Whitehouse further shows:
validating the mail piece (Abstract).

53. As to claim 84, Whitehouse shows all of the elements of claim 70, but does not expressly show:

the postage information and the request for an indexing tracking ID are sent separately by the end user computer.

However, Bailey shows that the postage information is separate from the request for a indexing tracking ID (Paragraph 0005). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of Whitehouse to send the request for the indexing tracking ID separately from the postage data as taught by Bailey in order to properly interact with the USPS.

54. Claims 79, 80, and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitehouse in view of Harmon (“Reading Between the Lines”).

As to claims 79 and 80, Whitehouse shows all of the elements of claims 71 and 79, but does not expressly show the use of a one-dimensional barcode or human-readable characters for the indexing tracking ID.

However, Harmon shows the use of one-dimensional barcodes within the USPS (Table 2.1, Chapter 2, pages 1-2 of 4) and human-readable text that is also machine-readable through optical character recognition (OCR) (Table 1.1, Chapter 1, pages 4-5 of 5) as alternate data collection techniques.

The sole difference between Whitehouse and the claimed subject matter is that Whitehouse does not disclose the alternative data collection methods claimed.

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit in separate references, the differences between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself- that is in the substitution of the one-dimensional barcode or human-readable text of Harmon for the two dimensional barcode of Whitehouse.

Thus, the simple substitution of one known element for another producing a predictable result renders the claims obvious.

55. As to claim 82, Whitehouse shows all of the elements of claim 70 but does not expressly show:

mailing the mail piece without a postage indicium.

However, Harmon shows a retail shipping label that contains an indexing tracking ID (sort/track data, upper right corner, Figure 6.7, Chapter 6, page 11 of 15), but lacking the postage indicium data. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of Whitehouse to include the shipping label shown by Harmon, in order to not have to print the postage indicium data on every mail piece.

56. Claims 24, 25, 66, and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Whitehouse/Bailey combination as applied to claims 1, 14, and 22 above, and further in view of Harmon.

57. As to claims 24 and 25, the Whitehouse/Bailey combination shows all of the elements of claims 71 and 79, but does not expressly show the use of a one-dimensional barcode or human-readable characters for the indexing tracking ID.

However, Harmon shows the use of one-dimensional barcodes within the USPS (Table 2.1, Chapter 2, pages 1-2 of 4) and human-readable text that is also machine-readable through optical character recognition (OCR) (Table 1.1, Chapter 1, pages 4-5 of 5) as alternate data collection techniques.

The sole difference between the Whitehouse/Bailey combination and the claimed subject matter is that the Whitehouse/Bailey combination does not disclose the alternative data collection methods claimed.

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit in separate references, the differences between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself- that is in the

substitution of the one-dimensional barcode or human-readable text of Harmon for the two dimensional barcode of the Whitehouse Bailey combination.

Thus, the simple substitution of one known element for another producing a predictable result renders the claims obvious.

58. As to claim 66, Whitehouse/Bailey combination shows all of the elements of claim 1, but does not expressly show:

requesting the indexing tracking ID from the postal authority; and
receiving the indexing tracking ID from the postal authority.

However, Harmon shows the use of user requested (the user requests use of the shipping service which requires receipt of the indexing tracking ID), postal authority issued indexing tracking ID (Chapter 6, Application 1 – Sortation and tracking applications, pages 3-5 of 15)

59. As to claim 68, the Whitehouse/Bailey combination shows all of the elements of claim 14, but does not expressly show:

the mail piece does not have the data corresponding to the postage indicium located thereon.

However, Harmon shows a retail shipping label that contains an indexing tracking ID (sort/track data, upper right corner, Figure 6.7, Chapter 6, page 11 of 15), but lacking the postage indicium data. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of Whitehouse to include the shipping label shown by Harmon, in order to not have to print the postage indicium data on every mail piece.

Response to Arguments

60. Applicant's arguments filed 27 December 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
61. Applicants argued that each of the independent claims is patentable as amended. As shown by the rejections above, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.
62. Applicants further argued that the indexing tracking ID of the Whitehouse reference is not independent of the indicium. As noted above, there is no clearly stated definition as to what Applicants use of independent means. Therefore, the Examiner has provided a common usage definition above. The Examiner believes the ID and indicium disclosed by Whitehouse are independent as defined by the above definition.

Conclusion

63. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
64. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

65. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOSHUA MURDOUGH whose telephone number is (571)270-3270. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 7:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

66. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Fischer can be reached on (571) 272-6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

67. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

J. M.
Examiner, Art Unit 3621

/Jalatee Worjloh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3621